

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 is pending and rejected in the above-identified application. Claim 1 is herein amended to place the application in better condition for examination. No new matter has been entered. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to Office Action dated January 30, 2007.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. To overcome this rejection, Applicants amend claim 1 to recite: *wherein protruding portions are formed in respective corner areas of the bottom fitting portion and extend toward [[the]] corresponding corner portions of the bottom of the large folding container.* Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 is now moot.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by *Anderson* (U.S. Patent No. 4,662,532).

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each and EVERY element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. However, in rejecting claim 1, the Examiner mischaracterized *Anderson* as disclosing a structure having a long-side (61) higher than a short-side bank (27), a bottom fitting portion (51,52), protruding portions (41,42,43,44), and fitting concave portions (64,67,70,70a). It is clear from the specification and figure that *Anderson* does NOT disclose a structure wherein *long-side bank portions of a bottom of a large folding container are configured to be higher than short-side bank portions of the bottom.* See

claim 1. Element 61 is not the “long-side bank portion of a bottom of a large folding container” in the cited reference. The long-side portion (which is adjacent to the upright wall 61 side) illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 is “lower” than the short-side portion. Accordingly, the cited reference does NOT disclose each and EVERY element of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, *Anderson* does NOT disclose a structure wherein *protruding portions are formed in respective corner areas of the bottom fitting portion and extend toward corresponding corner portions of the bottom of the large folding container and wherein said protruding portions are fitted into respective fitting concave portions formed in the folding container below when the folding containers are assembled into a box shape and stacked on one another*. See claim 1. Instead, *Anderson* describes the following: “The top of posts 69 and 71 have holes 70 and 70A. The plugs (46-69) on the bottom of similar size second container are adapted to fit into the holes in the top of posts 56, 57, 69 and 71 to facilitate the stacking of the second container on top of container 20.” *See* col. 3, lines 20-49, 45-49. Thus, *Anderson* discloses a different structure from the claimed invention, e.g., no concave portion formed in the folding container below. Thus, the cited reference does NOT disclose each and EVERY element of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claim 1.

Application No. 10/761,379  
Attorney Docket No. 032181

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Response Due: April 25, 2007

**Conclusion**

In view of the aforementioned amendment and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claim, as herein amended, is in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Darren A. Auito

Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,024  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/klf